REMARKS

The undersigned attorney thanks Examiner Pesin for his careful review of this patent application and for his time in participating in an examiner interview on October 20, 2005. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Claims 3-7, 21-23, 30-31, 64, and 75-93 are currently pending in this Application with claims 3, 6-7, 21-23, 30-31, and 64 being amended, claims 8-20, 32-47, and 65-74 being cancelled, claims 75-93 being added, and claims 1-2, and 48-63 being canceled by a previous amendment. Prior to entry of this amendment, claims 3-47 and 64-74 were pending in the application. Claims 3-47, and 64-74 were rejected.

Examiner Interview on October 20, 2005

During the examiner interview on October 20, 2005, Examiner Pesin and the undersigned attorney discussed the pending claims and their support in the specification. The undersigned provided original copies of the filed drawings for Examiner Pesin and explained how the drawings and the associated portions of the specification provide support for the claims.

Claim Rejections

Claims 3-47 were initially rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement because the specification does not support the claimed limitation of "wherein at least one of the user accesses is to an object of interest that is not in the task sequence." In the examiner interview, the undersigned attorney provided Examiner Pesin with original copies of the filed drawings and explained how Figures 7 and 11 support this claim limitation. Specifically, Figure 11 shows a task sequence and a path taken by a user that included access to an object of interest that is not in the task sequence. Near the top of the screen shown in Figure 11, a task is shown. The task shown is the "Buying" task and it is defined as including the steps of (1) 'index'; (2) one of the following: ww1aviation, jetspostwwii, civilpostwwii, makeentry, miscellaneous; and (3) preorder. Additionally, Figure 11 shows a sample user sequence under the heading "dominant path". Notably, this user sequence includes several objects of interest which are not part of the defined path 'Buying'. Accordingly, Figure

11 clearly supports the claim limitation of "wherein at least one of the user accesses is to an object of interest that is not in the task sequence."

The Applicants respectfully submit that the claim elements of claims 3-7, 21-23, and 30-31 are supported by the specification and are in condition for allowance.

Claims 64-72 were initially rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,934,748 to Louviere et al. (hereafter *"Louviere"*). *Louviere* is directed toward an automated on-line experiment to measure user behavior in response to changes in a set of content elements. As described in the reference, the experiments involve modifying the visual appearance of objects on a web site and determining whether a user accesses a particular object. *Louviere* generally discusses that the system may be used to track additional behaviors, such as whether a user made a purchase. However, it appears that *Louviere* only monitors whether a user clicks on the object being tested or completes a specified action. It does not appear to record data regarding a user's sequential use of a website.

In one example shown in *Louviere*, an experiment is set up to determine the most effective way to get users to click on a banner advertisement. In the experiment, the operator wishes to test use the banner advertisement when displayed with these variations: (1) static banner advertisement with a "click" message, (2) static banner advertisement with a "save" message, (3) moving banner advertisement with a "click" message, and (4) moving banner advertisement with a "save" message. See *Louviere* col. 9, ll. 24-35. The experiment is conducted by displaying these variations to a plurality of users to determine which one yields the most user clicks. In this example, *Louviere* is only concerned with whether the user clicks on the banner advertisement and it does not record any other actions taken by the user. The results of the experiment will show which version of the banner advertisement attracts the most users.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention is directed towards a significantly more complicated problem than that addressed in *Louviere*. Users interact with various systems, including web sites, through a variety of user interfaces. If the user interface is well constructed, the users may navigate the site efficiently. If the user interface is not well constructed, users may navigate the site in a very inefficient manner and may have difficulty completing desired tasks. One aspect of the present invention monitors users and displays *how* they interact with the site and *how* they perform a particular task; not just whether they

completed the task. The Applicants respectfully submit that monitoring users to display how they perform a task is significantly different from testing to see if a user accesses a particular object. Furthermore, the Applicants respectfully submit that monitoring users to display how they performed a task is significantly different than merely determining whether a user completed a particular task.

The Applicants have amended claims 3 and 64 to highlight certain distinctions between the claimed invention and the prior art. The amendments to claim 3 and 64 highlight the features of accessing structural data of a resource, accessing user data showing how the user interacted with the resource, and graphically displaying the hierarchical representation of the navigation structure overlaid by either user paths taken in completing a task (claim 3) or a representation of filtered data (claim 64). The graphical display of user data overlaying the navigation structure of the resource provides useful information about *how* the user completed a task. Such information is significantly more useful in designing a user interface than merely showing whether the task was completed.

Specifically, claims 3 and 64 were amended to recite the limitations of "accessing structural data regarding the navigation structure of the objects of interest in a resource", "accessing session data representative of one or more sessions of user interaction with the resource where a session identifies a sequence of user accesses to said one or more of said plurality of objects of interest, wherein at least one of the user accesses is to an object of interest that is not in the task sequence", and "graphically displaying a path taken by a user in completing the task sequence." Additionally, claim 3 was amended to recite the limitation of "graphically displaying a hierarchical representation of objects of interest and their navigation structure, overlaid with a representation of the paths taken in the user accesses to perform the task." Also, claim 64 was amended to recite the limitations of "at least one of the user accesses is to an object of interest that is not in the task sequence", "filtering the data representative of one or more sequences of user accesses to include only a set of sessions based on a filter criteria", and "graphically displaying a hierarchical representation of objects of interest and their navigation structure, overlaid with a representation of the filtered session usage data." These additional elements highlight several differences between the present invention and the prior art.

The claims, as amended, significantly differentiate *Louviere* from the claimed invention. For example, *Louviere* does not describe steps of accessing structural data regarding the navigation structure of objects of interest; it does not describe accessing a sequence of user accesses to objects of interest, where at least one of the user accesses is to an object of interest that is not in the task sequence; and it does not describe graphically displaying a hierarchical representation of objects of interest and their navigational structure overlaid with either the paths taken by a user or with a representation of filtered session usage data. Accordingly, *Louviere* lacks several features claimed in claims 3 and 64.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3 and 64 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art and Applicants respectfully request passing of the case to issuance in due course of Patent Office business. Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 4-7, 21-23, 30-31, and 75-93 are also allowable for the various additional limitations contained therein, which further distinguish the prior art.

Please note that claims 75-93 are new dependant claims that depend directly, or indirectly, from claim 64. The Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is included in the new claims.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections should be withdrawn and Claims 3-7, 21-23, 30-31, 64, and 75-93 are in condition for allowance.

FEES

Enclosed with this Response and Amendment is a three-month petition for extension of time, and the Commissioner is authorized to debit deposit account No. 20-1507 for this fee. Through the present *Response to Final Office Action*, 40 claims were canceled and 28 dependent claims were added. Accordingly, $510.00 is due for the three month extension of time fee.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the *Office Action* mailed October 6, 2005. It is respectfully submitted that claims 3-7, 21-23, 30-31, 64, and 75-93 are in condition for allowance and that each point raised in the *Office Action* with regard to these claims has been fully addressed. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn and that the case be processed to issuance in accordance with Patent Office Business.

If the Examiner believes that there are any issues that can be resolved by a telephone conference, or that there are any informalities that can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, please contact James Schutz at 404.885.3498.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____
James E. Schutz
Registration No. 48,658
Attorney for Applicant

Troutman Sanders LLP
600 Peachtree Street, NE
Suite 5200
Atlanta, Georgia 30308-2216
(404) 885-3498